



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/911,391 | 07/25/2001 | Hideo Ando | 211260US2SDIV | 4764 |
| 22850 | 7590 | 04/06/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | | SHIBRU, HELEN |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2621 | | | | |

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/911,391 | ANDO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | HELEN SHIBRU | 2621 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 34,37,40 and 47-49 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 34,37,40 and 47-49 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/23/04&11/05/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendments, filed 02/16/2006, have been entered and made of record. Claims 30-33, 35-36, 38-39, and 41-45 are cancelled and claims 34, 37, 40, and 47-49 are pending. The Applicant submitted terminal disclaimer and therefore the non-statutory double patenting rejections of claims 30, 33, 36, 39, and 42 are hereby withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/16/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See the new ground(s) of rejections set below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 34, 37, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. There is no means recited in these claims that can perform the recording function. See MPEP § 2172.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 34, 37, 40, 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims are directed to a recording medium storing nonfunctional descriptive material.

Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are neither physical "things" nor statutory

processes. See, e.g. Warmerdam, 33 F. 3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory) and merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material stored in a computer-readable medium does not make it statutory. In addition a mere arrangements or compilations of facts or data, are merely stored so as to be read or outputted by a computer without creating any functional interrelationship either as part of the stored data or as part of the computing processes performed by the computer then such descriptive material alone does not impart functionality either to the data as so structured, or to the computer, and therefore are not statutory. See MPEP 2106.IV.B.1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 34, 37, 40, 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Murase (US Pat. NO. 6,285,826).

Claim 47 will be discussed first.

Regarding claim 47, Murase discloses an information storage medium comprising; an audio recording area configured to store audio information of tunes or music in unit of a track (see figures 1-4, col. 9 lines 1-8, col. 20 lines 33-59 and col. 23 lines 33-42),

a still picture recording area configured to store one or more pieces of still picture information relating to said audio information (see fig. 3, col. 9 lines 1-8 and 18-22), and a management area configured to store management information with respect to the track of said audio information (see col. 14 lines 21-52);

said management area including program chain information configured to control a reproduction sequence of said audio information in accordance with an order of recording said audio information (see col. 14 lines 21-52), and user-defined program chain information configured to control another reproduction sequence of said audio information, said another reproduction sequence being free of the recording order of said audio information (see col. 9 line 58-col. 10 line 3, col. 24 line 28-32 and figures 43 and 44);

and said user-defined program chain information including still picture designation information configured to designate one or more pieces of said still picture information (see col. 26 line 61-col. 27 line 10), and

said management area including an index point corresponding to a head of the tune or music within said audio recording area (see figures 32-33 and 35A-B and col. 5 lines 20-29 and col. 26 lines 41-55).

Regarding claim 34, see figures 31-33 and 43-45.

Regarding claim 37, see figures 43-44 and col. 23 lines 44-58 and col. 24 lines 28-44.

Regarding claim 40, see figures 43-44.

Regarding claim 48, the limitation of claim 48 can be found in claim 47. Therefore claim 48 is analyzed and rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 47 above.

Art Unit: 2621

Regarding claim 49, the limitation of claim 49 can be found in claim 47 above. It is also noted that the reproducing method is disclosed in col. 25 line 57-col. 27 line 33 of Murase. Therefore claim 49 is analyzed and rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 47 above.

Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

1. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

2. Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 34, 37, 40, 47-49 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 09/911462 in view of Murase. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the reasons sets forth below.

The limitation of claim 47 is cited in claim 30 of application 09/911462. Claim 47 is differ from application 09/911462 in that the claim further requires management area including an index point corresponding to a head of the tune or music within said audio recording area.

In the same field of endeavor Murase discloses management area including an index point corresponding to a head of the tune or music within said audio recording area (see figures 32-33 and 35A-B and col. 5 lines 20-29 and col. 26 lines 41-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an index point in order to search the desired stored audio data.

The limitations of claim 34 is cited in claims 31 of application 09/911462.

The limitations of claim 37 are cited in claim 32 of application 09/911462.

The limitation of claim 40 is cited in claim 33 of application 09/911462.

The limitation of claim 48 is cited in claim 35 of application 09/911462 and as disclosed in regarding claim 47 above.

The limitation of claim 49 is cited in claim 34 of application 09/911462 and as disclosed in regarding claim 47 above.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

10. Claims 34, 37, 40, 47-49 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 09/911461 in view of Murase. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the reasons sets forth below.

The limitation of claim 47 is cited in claim 30 of application 09/911461. Claim 47 is differ from application 09/911462 in that the claim further requires management area including an index point corresponding to a head of the tune or music within said audio recording area.

In the same field of endeavor Murrase discloses management area including an index point corresponding to a head of the tune or music within said audio recording area (see figures 32-33 and 35A-B and col. 5 lines 20-29 and col. 26 lines 41-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an index point in order to search the desired stored audio data.

The limitations of claim 34 is cited in claims 32 of application 09/911461.

The limitations of claim 37 are cited in claim 35 of application 09/911461.

The limitation of claim 40 is cited in claim 37 of application 09/911461.

The limitation of claim 48 is cited in claim 40 of application 09/911461 and as disclosed in regarding claim 47 above.

The limitation of claim 49 is cited in claims 30 and 39 of application 09/911462 and as disclosed in regarding claim 47 above.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HELEN SHIBRU whose telephone number is (571) 272-7329. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, THAI Q. TRAN can be reached on (571) 272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Helen Shibru
March 20, 2006



The signature is handwritten in black ink. It consists of a stylized 'H' and 'T' followed by 'Q. TRAN'. Below the name, the words 'PRIMARY EXAMINER' are written in capital letters, all positioned above a thick diagonal line.